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1 Introduction

1.1 This statement of policy sets out the criteria and scoring methodology that the Prudential Regulation Authority (PRA) uses to identify other systemically important institutions (O-SIIs), as is required under the Capital Requirements Directive (2013/36/EU) (CRD) as implemented in the Capital Requirements (Capital Buffers and Macro-prudential measures) Regulations 2014.¹

1.2 In developing its approach to the identification of O-SIIs, the PRA has taken into consideration the European Banking Authority (EBA) Guidelines on the 'criteria to determine the conditions of application of Article 131(3) of Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD) in relation to the assessment of other systemically important institutions (O-SIIs)', referred to in the following as 'the EBA Guidelines'.² The approach outlined in this document is consistent with these Guidelines.

1.3 The EBA Guidelines set out an O-SII identification process consisting of two stages. The first stage is a minimum mandatory framework, which consists of a prescribed set of criteria, indicators and weights that authorities should use to identify the institutions that must be designated as O-SIIs. The second stage offers authorities the discretion to overlay the mandatory part of the framework in order to better reflect the specificities of the national banking sector, and if appropriate, designate additional firms as O-SIIs. The PRA has chosen to exercise this discretion and use its potential impact framework (see section 4 and appendix 1) to align the definition of O-SIIs broadly with 'Category 1' firms, whose disorderly failure would have the highest impact on the UK financial system and economy.

2 Which firms can be identified as O-SIIs?

2.1 In line with the CRD and EBA Guidelines, the framework outlined in this statement of policy is to be applied in relation to all credit institutions, investment firms, EEA parent institutions, EEA parent financial holding companies and EEA parent mixed financial holding companies within the domestic financial sector at their highest level of consolidation in the United Kingdom.

2.2 The framework is not applied to: i) EEA and third-country branches of overseas firms, ii) investment firms not regulated by the PRA, and iii) firms holding less than 0.02% of the total assets of UK credit institutions and investment firms. The rationale for this is as follows:

(i) The CRD does not allow the designation of third country and EEA branches of overseas banks operating in the UK as O-SIIs. Therefore these institutions are not considered for O-SII designation. In line with the EBA Guidelines, the PRA, however, includes the activity of UK branches of overseas banks in the denominators used for calculating indicator scores.

(ii) The framework is only applied to those investment firms designated for prudential supervision by the PRA. The Statement of Policy 'Designation of investment firms for prudential supervision by the Prudential Regulation Authority'³ outlines the PRA’s designation policy, which takes into account the criteria of size, substitutability, interconnectedness, and complexity; the same criteria set out in article 131(2) CRD and the EBA Guidelines. Therefore, if an investment firm has not been designated for supervision by the PRA, this means that the PRA has

¹ www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2014/894/contents/made
assessed that the investment firm is not systemically important. This assessment is sufficient to comply with the O-SII assessment methodology set out in the CRD and the EBA Guidelines.

(iii) The PRA uses the discretion provided in the EBA Guidelines to exclude firms from the identification process which - at their highest level of consolidation in the UK - hold less than 0.02% of the total assets of credit institutions and investment firms authorised in the UK. Estimates of these firms’ activity are included in the denominators used for calculating indicator scores.

3 EBA’s mandatory scoring methodology for O-SII identification

3.1 Under the mandatory element of the EBA Guidelines, O-SIIs should be identified based on a score calculated using the categories, indicators and weightings set out in Table 1. Data item definitions are provided in the EBA Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance (including substitutability/financial system infrastructure)</td>
<td>Value of domestic payment transactions</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private sector deposits from depositors in the EU</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private sector loans to recipients in the EU</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity/ cross-border activity</td>
<td>Value of OTC derivatives (notional)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-jurisdictional liabilities</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-jurisdictional claims</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>Intra-financial system liabilities</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-financial system assets</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debt securities outstanding</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The PRA calculates each relevant entity’s mandatory score by:

(iv) dividing the indicator value of each individual relevant entity by the aggregate amount of the respective indicator values summed across all institutions in scope of this framework, authorised in the UK (the ‘denominators’);

(v) multiplying the resulting percentages by 10,000 to express the indicator scores in terms of basis points;

(vi) calculating the category score for each relevant entity by taking a simple average of the indicator scores in that category; and

(vii) calculating the overall score for each relevant entity by taking a simple average of its four category scores. Therefore, the final score can be interpreted as a firm’s weighted average

---

1 As outlined in section 2 of this Statement of Policy.
market share across the activities contributing to systemic importance, measured in basis points.

3.3 EEA and third-country branches of overseas banks operating in the UK are not assessed as part of this framework, but estimates of their activity are included in the denominators. As set out in section 2, the PRA also uses its discretion to exclude firms with a share of less than 0.02% of UK firms’ total assets from the framework, but includes estimates of their activity in the denominators.

3.4 Under the EBA Guidelines, the default cut-off for being automatically designated as an O-SII is 350 basis points. The Guidelines provide national discretion to raise or lower this threshold by 75 basis points. The PRA has chosen not to exercise this discretion.

4 The PRA’s supervisory overlay – the potential impact framework

4.1 In addition to the mandatory scoring methodology, the EBA Guidelines request that national authorities should assess whether further firms should be designated as O-SIIs based on the mandatory indicator scores, or on additional qualitative and/or quantitative indicators of systemic importance. National authorities can select indicators that adequately capture systemic importance for their domestic economy or the EU economy from the list in Annexes 1 and 2 of the EBA Guidelines.

4.2 The PRA uses the quantitative methodology of its existing potential impact framework (as set out in the PRA’s approach to banking supervision1) to inform its assessment of whether further firms should be designated as O-SIIs. All quantitative indicators of systemic importance used in this framework which are relevant to credit institutions and investment firms are available under the EBA Guidelines. The potential impact framework complements the EBA’s mandatory scoring methodology by measuring activities that are critical to the UK economy and financial system, in line with the PRA’s focus on the risk of disruption to the continuity of supply of critical economic functions.

4.3 The potential impact framework classifies firms into different categories of impact to help the PRA determine the appropriate level of supervisory intensity for a firm. This framework reflects a firm’s potential to affect adversely the stability of the system by failing, coming under stress, or the way it carries on its business. This effect can take place through two broad channels – the first is directly, through the impact on real economic activity or on the soundness of other participants, and so the provision of financial services to the economy as a whole. The second is indirectly, through behavioural effects where vulnerabilities within one firm affect confidence in other firms with similar business models or products.

4.4 The PRA judges that the credit institutions and investment firms classified as ‘Category 1’ under the potential impact framework should be designated as O-SIIs in the UK, unless they have been classified as ‘Category 1’ firms only because of their activity conducted in the United Kingdom through EEA and third-country branches of overseas firms. The PRA’s approach to banking supervision document defines ‘Category 1’ firms as the most significant deposit-takers and designated investment firms whose size, interconnectedness, complexity and business type give them the capacity to cause very significant disruption to the UK financial system (and through that to economic activity more widely) by failing or by carrying on their business in an unsafe manner. The scale of such adverse effects depends both on the functions a firm provides, and its significance within the financial system. Some of the critical economic

---

1 PRA approach documents: www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/Pages/other/pra/supervisoryapproach.aspx.
functions that firms provide are: payment, settlement and clearing; retail banking; corporate banking; intra-financial system borrowing and lending; investment banking; and custody services. The scale of a firm’s potential impact also depends on its size, complexity, business type and interconnectedness with the rest of the financial system. The part of the potential impact framework used in O-SII identification – namely the indicators and weightings that are relevant to banks and investment firms, rather than to insurers - is set out in Appendix 1.¹

4.5 The PRA calculates the firms’ supervisory overlay scores based on the indicators set out in Table 1 of Appendix 1, in line with the calculation method outlined in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3. This score then forms the basis for the PRA to use judgment on whether to designate firms as O-SIs. Under the current potential impact framework, all Category 1 firms that are subject to O-SII assessment have scores exceeding 100 basis points. Therefore the PRA expects to designate firms whose supervisory overlay score exceeds 100 basis points as O-SIs.

4.6 There are cases in which the PRA may designate firms as O-SIs whose supervisory overlay score is below 100 basis points.

(i) Firms scoring just below 100 basis points that have been designated in the previous year may be designated as O-SIs if the PRA judges that they are systemically important to the UK or the EU economy.

(ii) The quantitative elements of the O-SII assessment methodology are applied at the highest level of consolidation in the UK, but some subsidiaries of overseas groups do not have a single consolidation in the UK. Where one of the subsidiaries has been designated as an O-SII, the PRA can use supervisory judgement to designate any of its sister subsidiaries in the UK as O-SIs, if interdependencies between the subsidiaries mean that the resilience of the O-SII could be threatened by the failure of a sister subsidiary.

4.7 If the potential impact framework is changed in future, this may also require the threshold to be changed, and this statement of policy to be updated accordingly.

5 O-SII identification timetable and publication

5.1 The PRA will conduct the O-SII identification annually and publish the list of firms designated as O-SIs by 1 December each year. It will also publish:

(i) The mandatory score of each firm designated as an O-SII under the EBA’s mandatory O-SII scoring methodology.

(ii) The supervisory overlay score of each firm designated as an O-SII under the supervisory overlay. If the supervisory overlay score of a firm designated as an O-SII does not exceed 100 basis points, the PRA will publish the rationale for designating this firm.

¹ The PRA also applies the potential impact framework to insurance firms. Therefore the framework also includes indicators relevant to insurance firms. These indicators are not used for O-SII identification.
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1. The PRA’s potential impact framework
Appendix 1: The PRA’s potential impact framework

In the PRA’s potential impact framework, a firm’s potential impact score is calculated based on its significance in a number of categories (eg ‘retail banking’). A firm’s significance in each category is measured as the firm’s share of PRA-regulated firms’ activity. A number of indicators (eg ‘value of retail deposits’) measure a firm’s activity within each category. The market shares in each indicator are averaged within categories using the weights outlined in the fourth column of Table 1. Subsequently, the overall potential impact score is calculated by averaging across the categories using equal weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category weight (%)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Weight within category (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Banking</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Value of Retail Deposits</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value of Retail Lending</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Retail Customers</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Banking</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Value of Corporate Deposits</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value of Corporate Lending</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-financial Banking</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Intra-financial Liabilities (Deposits, Repos, Derivatives)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-financial Assets (Loans, Reverse Repos, Derivatives)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment, Settlement&amp; Clearing services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Daily Average Value of CHAPS transactions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Average Value of BACS transactions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Average Value of CREST transactions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Average Value of LCH transactions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Custody assets</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Banking</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Trading Assets</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market transaction volumes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retail and corporate banking, and retail payments activities reflect the direct impact that the distress or failure of a systemic institution could have on the UK economy through the disruption or cessation of services. The larger an institution’s market share in these services, the less substitutable it is. The indicators selected to inform these criteria of systemic importance reflect the different types of transactions the financial institutions can have with the retail and corporate sectors.

The remaining criteria (intra-financial banking, settlements and clearing, custody services, investment banking) reflect other direct and indirect channels through which the distress or failure of institutions could pose a threat to the real economy, including through other intermediaries.

1 The PRA also applies the potential impact framework to insurance firms. Therefore the framework also includes indicators relevant to insurance firms. These indicators are not used for O-SI identification.